The Level and Factors of Education of People with Disabilities in Hungary in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century

Péter Tibor Nagy

Every census is a twofold scientific resource for historians of education. On the one hand. each census indicates the development of the general state of education of a particular country. on the other hand data referring to age groups (cohors) display a latent diacronity even within one single census.[1] There have already been several national census in Hungary which formulated questions concerning people with disabilities (Lakatos. 2003 ; Tausz 2004; Szabó. 2008). The present article does not undertake to present these findings in details. The present article relies only upon date of the census from 2001 and possessed exclusively by KSH (Central Statistical Office of the Hungarian Republic). [2]

The following analysis relies upon four data bases. The first one addresses people with disabilities from Budapest. Its parameters consist of: gender. cohors table for examined age categories of five years in a ranking of seventeen values and specifying thirteen different kinds of disabilities. level of education in a ranking of five categories. economic activity in four different categories and finally nine categories of possible religious denominations. The last column shows the number of individuals related to each combination. The second data base shows the same data on national level. The third and the fourth data bases contained those individuals who did not consider themselves to belong to any particular group of those with disabilities.

The first step of the present analysis was to unify the national data with the data from Budapest for both the groups of those with disabilities (disabled) and of those without disabilities. The outcome of the joint data base was to change the former thirteen category of people with disabilities to fourteen. the last one being a zero value. for those. who were without

---

1 http://www.archive.org/details/NationalCensus-Hungary1930 and http://www.archive.org/details/EducationalinequalitiesanddenominationsdatabaseforTransdanubia1910

2 Databases of the census 2001. Thanks for the help of the Central Statistical Office, Ms Janosne Waffenschmidt . See http://nepszamlalas.hu/eng/index.html

disabilities. The second step was the vertical unification of the data bases (taking one single combination of the parameters as one single case). then we subtracted the data referring to Budapest from the national data achieving in this way a separate data base for the province.[3] Following this step instead of using the national data base. we linked the data base of the province to that of Budapest. In addition to the joined data base we included one more parameter: is the person in question a Budapest dweller or not. The finally obtained data base consisted of 54338 lines which means that the total population of ten million was divided into 54338 groups. The 54338 groups contained 12779 empty categories. (For instance there was no retired. Lutheran. blind. high-school graduate woman in Budapest of over age eighty.) The rest of the categories proved to be useful. 27985 groups could be related to less than 10 person. 8854 to a group of 10-99 and only 4720 groups could be related to more than 100 person. Two-third of the cases were covered by categories of less than 1000 person. The simplified tables created after the re-organization of data as described above (for instance in three-dimensional tables) corresponded perfectly to the data published by the census. Therefore it can be taken for granted that once carried out. the results of our four-five-six-dimensional research. un-published so far. would supply us with reliable findings.

The social division of people with disabilities

The first question was designed to identify the magnitude of the population of those with disabilities as well as its social division in cohors. The answer does not rely upon the present data base but upon previously published census.

1. Table. The total population of those with disabilities: 1930-2001

	Total population			
cohors (year)	1930	1949	1990	2001
0–14	2392245	2290090	2136300	1694936
15–19	833956	776434	761625	668609
20–29	1587826	1555761	1285370	1596293
30–39	1280898	1237571	1621760	1309591

3 Specialities in the level of education in Budapest and countriside: Forray R., 2005., Kramurics-Szekeres, 2007. Nagy 2005.

40–49	986684	1308612	1398840	1533309
50–59	755334	963279	1201275	1314018
60–X	848166	1073052	1969650	2081559
Total	8685109	9204799	10374820	10198315
From that: Men				
0–14	1208908	1161281	1096140	867382
15–19	413287	389362	388785	341206
20–29	788202	748924	651565	815110
30–39	606133	585165	809120	659338
40–49	459291	631842	687125	747690
50–59	362650	434211	554080	615239
60–X	409981	472635	792720	804685
Total	4248452	4423420	4979535	4850650

2. Table. The percentage of the population of those with disabilities

cohors (year)	1930	1949	1990	2001
0–14	0.16	0.48	1.57	1.70
15–19	0.41	1.06	2.07	2.08
20–29	0.50	1.59	2.12	2.06
30–39	0.59	2.35	2.48	2.86
40–49	0.66	2.49	3.51	5.50
50–59	0.69	3.74	5.30	9.20
60–X	0.86	4.05	7.05	12.43
Totaly	0.480	2.009	3.550	5.658

The number of people with disabilities had increased significantly between 1930 and 2001. The reason is that the criteria of disabilities went through an increased attitude of „humanism”; therefore it became easier to be considered with disabilities.

Despite the fact that the middle-generation had been seriously affected by the First World War the percentage of the people with disabilities was rather low in 1930. The cause of the relatively high ratio of the wounded was especially the new armament which resulted many cases of amputation. blindness and deafness. It is obvious in the meantime that there was no massacre of populations to a scale similarly large to the scale of mass crimes in the Second World War: none of the conflicting parties aimed at erasing civilians on a mass scale or at planning genocide provoking in this way also a much greater number of wounded as well as many more conflicts between troops and civilians. In the First World War major cities were

neither bombed nor blockaded. One would expect a significantly greater number of people with disabilities among the men of the generations enrolled in the army as an obvious consequence of these historical facts. Contrary to such expectations data show that the highest percentage among the men with disabilities in 1930 could be found in the cohors of 15-19 (62%). All the groups older than this one show an increasingly smaller percentage of disabilities. It can be concluded that the high number of the wounded in the war did not affect the overall percentage of the people with disabilities in the entire population.

Data recorded in the census from 1949 were entirely different from the results in 1930. The percentage of the people with disabilities was four times higher. Whereas in the cohors 20-29 there were less than 8000 person with disabilities in 1930. this number is more than 10000 in case of the same cohors in 1949. A difference to this scale could only be caused by the Second World War. The percentage of people with disabilities among the men of the generations enrolled as troops was more than 70%.

The last two census of the century could not be influenced by any similar cataclysm. In these last two cases the increase of the percentage of people with disabilities and the deterioration of public health in general could only be caused by accidents at the workplace. by aspects of life style as well as by the changed pension policy for people with disabilities. Compared to the age group of twenties the . the first decade showed an increase of 1.4 times and in older cohors it arrived at an increase of 2.0. But this increase is not higher among men. than among women.

By the turn of the millennium the legal as well as medical situation of the people with disabilities became much more directly related to the age than before. Whereas in 1930 the ratio in the cohors 50-59 was only 1.7 times higher than in the cohors 15-19. in 2001 the same ratio was 4.4.

One can raise the question that if the percentage of the people with disabilities and of those with damaged health among the adults had increased so much. is it meaningful at all to relate their level of education to the society-wide average in relation to their cohors? More precisely: does not the lower level of education of people with disabilities simply reflect the fact that

people with lower education tend in general to carry out medically more risky labor activities respectively. are they not more inclined to live a more health-damaging life anyway?
The problem with the above question is however that it does not address the phenomena in sufficient depth: the time when the majority of those who were found disabled in 2001 have damaged their health was the period of a major upheaval in the adult education. Therefore the low level of education of people with disabilities does not only reflect that the possibility among the less educated to become disabled in an adult age was higher. but it also shows the fact that these individuals were *not included into adult education either during socialism or later.*
Consequently by examining the related cohors the present analysis focuses primarily on the relationship between the level of education of people with disabilities on the one hand and the level of education of the average population on the other hand. It is the cohors which carry the latent diacronity. Therefore contrary to the usual procedure of census statistics the following tables show the date of birth instead of showing the age.

The cohors data of the level of education

The first step was to examine the level of education of the population according to cohors. (The years at the beginning of the table may indicate plus/minus 2 years; the exception is the line 1916 which sums up the data of those born in the first two decades of the 20. century.
For an easier application of the data the figures refering to the level of education were turned into rounded values. The last column of the table was not modified because we added the values from the upper column to the column one level down. Thus the first category: „less than eight graduated classes" became unnecessary because by rounding up the values. the value of this category would be constantly 100 %.

3. Table
The level of education in the entire population in rounded %. (the lower degrees preclude the higher ones)

	Eight Class year	Secondary school without graduation	Secondary school with graduation	university/ university college

1916	37.4%	14.7%	12.9%	4.6%
1924	42.9%	16.9%	15.3%	5.5%
1929	60.8%	21.3%	19.8%	7.5%
1934	73.7%	24.2%	22.8%	8.5%
1939	86.7%	30.4%	29.2%	9.5%
1944	93.7%	48.1%	38.4%	13.9%
1949	96.8%	66.6%	44.6%	14.3%
1954	97.4%	69.7%	42.5%	14.4%
1959	97.0%	73.0%	42.2%	14.9%
1964	97.5%	78.0%	44.6%	16.1%
1969	97.9%	78.9%	44.9%	15.3%
1974	98.0%	79.9%	45.0%	14.8%
1979	97.9%	82.3%	50.9%	5.6%
1984	93.8%	66.7%	15.6%	-
(1989)	(5.9%)	-	-	-

See: Földvári- Leeuwen. 2008. L. Nagy. 1991. Bukodi. 1998.Forray R.-Híves 2009. Kertesi-Varga. 2005. Lannert. 2008. Polónyi. 2002.

4. Table
The level of education among people with disabilities

	Eight class year	Secondary school without graduation	Secondary school with graduation	university/ university college
1916	32.9%	12.0%	10.4%	3.7%
1924	37.2%	13.0%	11.5%	3.9%
1929	54.1%	16.0%	14.6%	5.0%
1934	66.6%	17.7%	16.3%	5.3%
1939	79.8%	21.6%	20.4%	5.6%
1944	88.4%	38.2%	26.2%	7.2%
1949	91.5%	54.9%	30.2%	6.4%
1954	90.0%	54.3%	26.1%	5.7%
1959	86.0%	53.1%	23.7%	5.6%
1964	82.3%	51.3%	22.6%	5.4%
1969	80.8%	45.7%	20.8%	5.4%
1974	79.9%	42.8%	20.9%	5.4%
1979	79.3%	45.6%	25.1%	2.0%
1984	68.3%	36.0%	6.6%	
1989	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	

See: Csereklei-File. 2007. Farkas. 2009. Klein. 2006. Bánfalvy. 2009. Marton. 2008. Mesterházi-Könczei. 2009

From the specific level of education of both the people with disabilities and those without we finally deduced a representational value. This value would only be 1. if the chances of people with disabilities for education would be the same as the opportunity of the entire cohors they belonged to.

5. Table. The under-representation index of people with disabilities

	Eight class year	Secondary school without graduation	Secondary school with graduation	university/ university college
1916	0.88	0.82	0.81	0.80
1924	0.87	0.77	0.75	0.71
1929	0.89	0.75	0.74	0.67
1934	0.90	0.73	0.71	0.62
1939	0.92	0.71	0.70	0.59
1944	0.94	0.79	0.68	0.52
1949	0.95	0.82	0.68	0.45
1954	0.92	0.78	0.61	0.40
1959	0.89	0.73	0.56	0.38
1964	0.84	0.66	0.51	0.34
1969	0.83	0.58	0.46	0.35
1974	0.82	0.54	0.46	0.36
1979	0.81	0.55	0.49	0.36
1984	0.73	0.54	0.42	
1989	0.41			

With regard to higher education it can be stated that *as we come closer to the present the disadvantage of the people with disabilities is increasing*. During war time their disadvantage had only doubled but it already showed a tendency of increase. Among those who were born in the first years of the consolidation of the post-1956-era. the ratio of disadvantage reached a triple value. Since the change of the regime (1990) the situation has not improved significantly but it has been somewhat positively influenced by the spread of mass-education.

The disadvantage had been increasing also among those graduating at least from high school level: although the chances of those born in the coalition period (1945-49) still reached two-third of the society-wide average. in case of those born in 1964 this index is only one half. The apprentice school education does not show a different tendency either. The least deterioration can be perceived around the time of high school graduation but the difference is minimal.

In conclusion it can be asserted that the decrease of the chances of the people with disabilities has been related to the increase of the overall level of education of the entire society: the younger is an individual with disabilities the more removed he/she is from the average of the society.

To specify the ratio of people with disabilities on the various levels of education demands an especially complex analysis because it has to be preceded by the separate counting of the disadvantages in every single age group and on every level of education of each age group. Moreover in case of such a specification it would also be necessary to consider the extent to which the chances of the various age groups to obtain various levels of education might be related to social discrimination. Relying upon an already existing method in the following part I attempt to specify the level of education of the groups under scrutiny in one single figure.

It is a well-known fact[4] that the higher the ratio of those who obtained a particular level of education in a particular age group the smaller the social value of that particular level. That is to say if in a particular age group the ratio of those who possess a university degree is 5%. then in case of that particular age group the social value of such a degree is higher than in case of another group in which it is 10% who possess the same degree. Similarly if in case of an entire generation 20% have not graduated from secondary school (eight classes). the mere fact of belonging to that group implies a lower social deprivation than in case of a group in which only 10% have not finished their secondary school.

If in case of a particular generation only 5% of the entire population possesses any degree of higher education. then on a ranking scale up to 100. the members of this group appear between 96-100. We attach the middle-value of this ranking to those who possess such a diploma: (100+96)/2 = 98. In the same group the ratio of those who graduated from secondary school is 10 %. therefore their position in the same ranking scale is between 86 and 95. In this particular cohors the value to be attached to those who graduated from secondary school is (86+95)/2 = 90.5. Assuming that the ratio of the apprentice school students is 10%. the attached value is (75+84)/2 = 79.5. Once education is spreading on a mass-scale the ratio of those who graduated from the higher education in a young cohors is 10% and in case of those who finished on a mid-level is 33 %. then: 1. the value attached to those who graduated from higher education is only (91+100)/2 = 95.5; 2. In case of the secondary school graduates it is between 68 and 90 -

4 See: Green GREEN, TH. F.: *Predicting the behavior of the educational system.* Syracuse University Press, Syracuse-New York, 1980.

accordingly. the value to be attached to this second category will only be (68+90)/2 = 79. Thus this value shows that as a result of the spreading of education on a mass-scale the social prestige of the secondary education degree will be the same as the prestige related to the apprentice school degree earlier. (This also implies that the average ratio of the graduated constantly remains 50.0 in every cohors.) (See: Nagy. 2008).

The relationship between the level of education of those with disabilities and of the entire population

	Indicators of the educational level of the disabled (A)	Figure (B)	Standard deviation (C)	Indicators of the educational level of the entire population (D)	Figure (E)	Standard deviation (F)	The disadvantage of the disabled (A/D)
1916+-	47.58	51830	23.83	50.00	279783	24.88	0.95
1924+-	46.64	50589	24.45	50.00	338823	25.74	0.93
1929+-	45.67	54083	26.12	50.00	437347	27.03	0.91
1934+-	44.73	52312	26.03	50.00	490297	26.72	0.89
1939+-	43.59	49860	25.27	50.00	535309	26.00	0.87
1944+-	42.51	59105	25.81	50.00	609276	27.19	0.85
1949+-	40.64	61795	26.52	50.00	704742	27.90	0.81
1954+-	38.29	51988	26.68	50.00	824725	27.89	0.77
1959+-	35.75	32347	27.04	50.00	708584	27.88	0.72
1964+-	32.10	20010	27.20	50.00	608734	27.80	0.64
1969+-	29.60	17486	27.41	50.00	700857	27.77	0.59
1974+-	28.44	16754	27.81	50.00	786991	27.72	0.57
1979+-	28.98	16162	28.39	50.00	809302	26.98	0.58
1984+-	30.87	13882	27.65	50.00	668609	26.52	0.62
1989+-	48.27	14142	7.70	50.00	624495	11.75	0.97
1994+-	50.00	10584	0.00	50.00	581985	0.00	1.00
1999+-	50.00	4077	0.00	50.00	488456	0.00	1.00
Total	41.47	577006	26.07	50.00	1019831 5	25.01	0.83

In the aggregation from above the educational disadvantage of people with disabilities is 0.83. This figure shows that the relative situation of those with disabilities among the youngest cohors of *each generation is slightly worsening*. The deepest level is reached in 1974 that is to say in the cohors which aged roughly 27 by the time of when date was obtained in 2001. In case of the somewhat younger group the relative situation of

the people with disabilities is slightly improving. In case of the last three age groups the value „1” (or the values very close to 1) is due to the fact that the people with disabilities who are younger than 15 simply did not yet have the „chance” to lag behind in society. (It is evident that if the „age group which has graduated less then eight classes” would not only be dealt with as one single unit but we would also possess its more detailed analysis. then the value of the real disadvantage before 1989. as well as of those born around 1994 would also be other than „1”.)

Relying upon this method the relative significance of the disadvantages can easily be specified.

		Indicator of the level of education	Figure	Standard deviation	Gender-related disadvantage	The relatively high ratio of the disadvantage of the male
1916+-	1.00 male	53.36	16072	26.57	0.940	0.988
	2.00 female"	44.98	35758	22.00	0.956	
	Total	47.58	51830	23.83	0.952	
1924+-	1.00 male	53.39	18213	26.56	0.927	0.994
	2.00 female"	42.85	32376	22.30	0.934	
	Total	46.64	50589	24.45	0.933	
1929+-	1.00 male	51.95	22184	27.06	0.906	0.992
	2.00 female"	41.30	31899	24.51	0.909	
	Total	45.67	54083	26.12	0.913	
1934+-	1.00 male	48.88	23957	26.06	0.884	0.989
	2.00 female"	41.21	28355	25.47	0.890	
	Total	44.73	52312	26.03	0.894	
1939+-	1.00 male	45.32	25089	25.18	0.864	0.992
	2.00 female"	41.85	24771	25.23	0.868	
	Total	43.59	49860	25.27	0.871	
1944+-	1.00 male	44.38	33427	25.51	0.847	0.997
	2.00 female"	40.07	25678	25.98	0.835	
	Total	42.51	59105	25.81	0.850	
1949+-	1.00 male	41.91	31883	25.23	0.817	1.006
	2.00	39.29	29912	27.76	0.804	

	female"					
	Total	40.64	61795	26.52	0.812	
1954+-	1.00 male	39.24	27727	25.09	0.785	1.024
	2.00 female"	37.21	24261	28.34	0.745	
	Total	38.29	51988	26.68	0.766	
1959+-	1.00 male	35.91	17884	25.34	0.735	1.028
	2.00 female"	35.56	14463	29.00	0.696	
	Total	35.75	32347	27.04	0.715	
1964+-	1.00 male	31.69	11452	25.84	0.662	1.031
	2.00 female"	32.65	8558	28.91	0.626	
	Total	32.10	20010	27.20	0.642	
1969+-	1.00 male	28.73	10331	26.12	0.605	1.024
	2.00 female"	30.86	7155	29.14	0.585	
	Total	29.60	17486	27.41	0.591	
1974+-	1.00 male	26.92	9957	26.53	0.577	1.015
	2.00 female"	30.67	6797	29.45	0.573	
	Total	28.44	16754	27.81	0.568	
1979+-	1.00 male	27.47	9676	27.38	0.592	1.022
	2.00 female"	31.25	6486	29.69	0.580	
	Total	28.98	16162	28.39	0.580	
1984+-	1.00 male	29.57	8090	27.09	0.607	0.985
	2.00 female"	32.68	5792	28.32	0.635	
	Total	30.87	13882	27.65	0.617	
1989+-	1.00 male	48.05	8279	7.01	0.968	1.003
	2.00 female"	48.57	5863	8.58	0.964	
	Total	48.27	14142	7.70	0.966	
1994+-	1.00 male	50.00	6288	0.00	1.000	1.000
	2.00 female"	50.00	4296	0.00	1.000	
	Total	50.00	10584	0.00	1.000	
1999+-	1.00 male	50.00	2359	0.00	1.000	1.000
	2.00 female"	50.00	1718	0.00	1.000	
	Total	50.00	4077	0.00	1.000	
Total	1.00 male	42.79	282868	26.41	0.855	1.031
	2.00 female"	40.20	294138	25.68	0.804	
	Total	41.47	577006	26.07	0.829	

Indicators of the level of education within the different denominations

Relig	National average	N	Std. Deviation	Average of the disabled	N	Std. Deviation	Disadvantage of the disabled
.00 -	46.38	69566	27.18	34.77	4688	27.31	0.75
Roman Catholic	49.27	5289521	24.90	41.83	324580	25.57	0.85
Greek Catholic	46.35	268935	24.74	38.44	16573	24.94	0.83
Calvinist	48.45	1622796	25.12	40.95	108767	25.51	0.85
Lutheran.	52.63	304705	24.65	45.45	21045	25.36	0.86
Jewish	72.00	12871	23.01	69.09	1082	25.64	0.96
Other	51.40	111785	26.07	42.02	7889	25.90	0.82
Do not belong	53.11	1483369	24.22	42.32	56915	27.92	0.80
No answer	51.85	1034767	25.77	37.40	35467	28.71	0.72
Total	50.02	10198315	25.01	41.47	577006	26.07	0.83

In terms of the level of education the Jews display a far better ratio than the national average. The groups which follow them – though with a far lower ratio - are those without denomination (14%) and the classically schooled Lutherans (3%). The group of the „other" denominations display a relatively wide scattering (1 %). The reason for this is that this particular group equally entails the highly educated members of the new religious movements and Unitarian intellectuals on the one hand. and the elderly village dwellers with a low level of education on the other hand. Even those who refused to answer the related question (10%) show a higher ratio than the national average. It is worth mentioning that according to the public opinion surveys[5] 25% declare to be without denomination therefore the ratio of 10% from above can be easily inferred from the aggregation of the ratio of those without denomination and from the ratio of those who refuse to answer.

It is a mathematically normal outcome that the group closest to the average level of education is the largest group of denomination. the Catholics (52%). followed by the second largest (in certain eastern counties the largest). the Calvinists

5 For example in the TÁRKI omnibusz survey which are repeated every month on a representative pattern of 1500. See: http://tarki.hu, http://nagypetertibor.uni.hu (or search for this characters:"nagypetertibor.uni.hu")

(16%). The last ones on the list are partly the Greek Catholics who mainly inhabit the rural areas (3%) as well as partly those whose denomination is un-known (not because of refusing to answer but because they themselves are not aware of their own denomination).

In case of those with disabilities the findings are *the same* as above. But the educational disadvantages of those with disabilities are rather high in relation to their denominational differences. In case of the Jews the disadvantage of those with disabilities is very small. only 0.96%. The group of those with disabilities are almost on the same level within the three mainstream denominations and even to the Greek Catholics. In case of those without denomination as well as among those who refused to answer this ratio is high.

It cannot be excluded that the significant difference is caused by the division of the different denominations between the provinces and the capital. Therefore the separate examination of the ratio in the capital city is a worthwhile research goal.

By restricting the research pattern to Budapest the findings show that the dramatic differences (the disadvantage of those who did not have an answer and of those. who refused to answer) are significantly lower that is to say. these groups come closer to the average level of disadvantage*. The disadvantage of the Jewish people wih disabilities continues to be the lowest also in Budapest. The ordering of the groups of those with disabilities among the main Christian churches remains the same as in the provinces.*

The outcome of this examination shows that the disadvantages of the people with disabilities among those who either refused or could not give an answer is significantly lower. The disadvantage continues to remain the smallest among the Jewish people with disabilities. In case of the main Christian churches the ordering is the same in Budapest as in the provinces.

By restricting the research pattern to the young the findings further confirm the least disadvantage among the Jews (0.96). followed by the group of the „other religions” but significantly lagging behind them (0.80). The next in the line are the Lutherans and the Roman Catholics. finally the Greek Catholics and the Calvinists.

In case of the young Calvinists the already existing

disadvantage is even deeper than in the entire Calvinist group. On the other pole of the axis among the Jews and among those following other religions the educational disadvantage of the young people with disabilities is only slightly higher than the disadvantage of the people with disabilities in general.

In light of the social macro-indicators at our disposal it looks like despite the secularization which has been lasting for decades. the religious background still proves to be the strongest factor with regard to the relative advantage or disadvantage of the people with disabilities.

References

Bánfalvy. Cs.: A fogyatékos emberek iskolai integrációjáról (A magyarországi integrációs folyamat és helyzet). In: Esély : társadalom- és szociálpolitikai folyóirat (20) 2009. p. 3-16.

Bukodi. E.: Nőttek-e az iskolázottsági esélyegyenlőtlenségek?. In: Századvég (3) 1998. p. 159.

Csereklei. G./File. Sz.: Egyenlő jogok. egyenlő esélyek - Gyorsjelentés a fogyatékosok helyzetéről. In: Mozgó világ (33) 2007. p. 17-21.

Farkas. M.: Bánfalvy Csaba: Az integrációs cunami. Tanulmányok a fogyatékos emberek iskolai és társadalmi integrációjáról. In: Gyógypedagógiai szemle (37) 2009. p. 51-53.

Green. Th. F.: *Predicting the behavior of the educational system.* Syracuse-New York. 1980.

Forray R.. K./Híves. T.: Az iskolázottság. a foglalkoztatottság és az ingázás területi összefüggései. In: Szociológiai szemle. 2009. p. 42-59.

Forray R.. K.: Budapest cigány/roma lakosságának iskolázottsága és foglalkoztatottsága. In: Educatio (14) 2005. p. 60-74.

Földvári. P./ Leeuwen. B. v.: A magyar lakosság átlagos iskolázottságának becslése. 1920-2006. In: Statisztikai szemle (86) 2008. p. 995-1005.

Hablicsek. L.: A roma népesség iskolázottságának területi alakulása: tények és becslések. In: Kisebbségkutatás (16) 2007. p. 729-766.

Husz. I.: Iskolázottság és a gyermekvállalás időzítése. In: Demográfia (49) 2006. 46-67. p.

Kertesi. G./Varga. J.: Foglalkoztatás és iskolázottság Magyarországon. In: Közgazdasági szemle (52) 2005. p. 633-662.

Klein. B./Klein. S./Joubert. K./Gyenis. Gy.: Intelligencia és iskolázottság Magyarországon. In: Mozgó világ (32) 2006. p 51-60..

Kramurics. T./Szekeres. J.: Az iskolázottság területi különbségei Magyarországon. In: Területi statisztika (47.) 2007 p. 319.

L. Nagy. Zs.: Iskolázottság és társadalmi emelkedés. In: História (13) 1991. p. 20-23.

Lakatos. M.: A fogyatékosság kérdése a magyar népszámlálásokban In: Védőnő (13) 2003. p. 5-7.

Lannert. J.: Iskolázottság. iskolarendszer és oktatáspolitika. In: Társadalmi riport (10) 2008. p. 324-343.

Marton Klára: Rejtőzködő fogyatékos-közösségek és a többségi társadalom. In: Világosság (49) 2008. p. 233-239.

Mesterházi. Zs/Könczei. Gy.: Fogyatékosság és társadalom. In: Háló: a Szociális Szakmai Szövetség hírlevele (15) 2009. p. 16.

Nagy. P. T.: Iskolázottság és vallásosság Budapesten. In: Educatio (14) 2005. p. 75-94.

Nagy. P. T.: Az iskolai elitek és az iskolázott elitek kutatása – in Pukánszky. B. (ed.): A neveléstörténet-írás új útjai. Budapest. 2008. p.

Polónyi. I.: A cigány népesség demográfiai. iskolázottsági és foglalkoztatási helyzete. In: Iskolakultúra (12) 2002. p. 44-56.

Tausz. K./Lakatos. M.: A fogyatékos emberek helyzete. In: Statisztikai szemle (82) 2004.

p. 370.
Szabó. Zs. K.: Lee. S./Matthiowetz. N.A./Tourangeau. R.: A fogyatékosság mérése a felvételekben : konzisztencia időben és válaszadók szerint. In: Statisztikai szemle (86) 2008. p.508.

Péter Tibor Nagy
University Professor

John Wesley College http://wesley.hu - Hungarian Institute for Educational Research and Development http://ofi.hu

H-1027 Budapest Margit 64 a II 3
nagy.peter.tibor@gmail.com http://nagypetertibor.uni.hu